

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Michael Joseph Kaminski,	)	Civil Action No.: 6:17-cv-02469-RBH-KFM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Michael Doyle, Billy Balies,	)	
Officer Morrison, Cpl. Catchot, and	)	
Randy Demory,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). *See* ECF No. 44. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court summarily dismiss two defendants from this action. *Id.* at p. 4.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983).

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s objections were due by April 5, 2018. *See* ECF Nos. 44 & 45.

The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge’s R & R [ECF No. 44]. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES Defendants Michael Doyle and Billy Balies** *without prejudice and without issuance and service of process*. This action remains pending against Defendants Officer Morrison, Cpl. Catchot, and Randy Demory.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
April 24, 2018

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge